fw

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,001	03/30/2001	Michael Sijacic	13220.002001; P5653	6688

32615 7590 05/31/2006

OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 09/823,001	**Applicant(s)** SIJACIC ET AL.	
	Examiner Gautam Sain	**Art Unit** 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)□ This action is non-final.

3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8,10-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8,10-21* is/are rejected.

7)□ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)□ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)□ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)□ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)□ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)□ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:

1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) □ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) □ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) □ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) □ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) □ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1) This is a Final rejection in response to Amendments/Remarks filed on 3/8/2006.

2) Claims 1, 4-8 and 10-21 are pending. Applicant previously cancelled claims 2, 3, and 9.

3) Effective filing date is 3/30/2001.

4) Independent claims 1, 10, 11 15 and 18 have been amended by Applicant. Applicant amended claim 11 to provide consistency with the other independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5-1) Claims 1, 8, 11, 12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Huben et al (5920867, issued Jul 6, 1999), in view of Maki et al (US 5201047, issued Apr 6, 1993), further in view of NonPatent Literature "A Distributed Scientific Data Archive Using the Web, XML and SQL/MED" by Mark Papiani (hereinafter "Papiani")(published date Sept 1999, ACM Press, pages 56-62).

Regarding claim 1, Van Huben teaches "defining a model ... field" (ie., provide a data management model structure as part of library ...)(col 7, lines 20-40; col 13, lines 59).

Van Huben teaches the currently amended claim limitation of *packaging the file and the model into an archive file, wherein the archive file is compressed and wherein a directory structure of the archive file reflects a structure of an object-oriented class of the custom data field.* First, the Examiner reasonably interprets *compressed* to mean clustering or grouping of files since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'compressed'. The Examiner reasonably interprets '*object-oriented class*' to be equivalent to a collection of object instances of classes with attribute members that can be of the same class since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'object-oriented class'. The Examiner reasonably interprets the limitation of '*archive file*' as equivalent to a standard file which contains data or a collection of data since the Application's specification does not specifically define 'archive file'. The specification provides exemplary descriptions that are not limiting of scope.

Generally, Van Huben discloses a data management system having data management configurations (Title), that creates a model to hold the actual pieces of the design under control of the system without limit to the number of libraries, to allow for a hierarchical design and support for multiple users (Abstract section). Specifically, Van Huben discloses identifying all of the files used to create a model or grouping files together to facilitate transport through the medium (col 6, lines 30-35) coupled with the need to archive and back up data onto another repository (col 28, lines 41-45). The examiner interprets this disclosure as equivalent to the claimed packaging the file and model into an archive file and compressing it. Additionally, Van Huben discloses an object oriented database having a collection of object instances of classes where the attributes are the members of the object class (col 7, lines 1-5). The Examiner interprets Van Huben's attributes as equivalent to the claimed custom data fields. Van Huben discloses a control file database having a collection of files arranged along the records and a directory database having a collection of file directories which contain files with relationships as described by the directory structure with sub-directories and/or files (col 7, lines 5-11). The Examiner interprets this disclosure by Van Huben as equivalent to the amended claimed limitation of a directory structure of the archive file reflecting a structure. Examiner interprets Van Huben's collection of files as equivalent to an archive of files since collecting files is equivalent to packaging them.

Van Huben teaches "wherein the process management system executes on the computer system" (ie., running on a computer in a client/server environment)(col 11, lines 20-25).

Van Huben teaches "adding the archive file into the process management system as a new class (ie., archiving and backing up is done with the Design Control Repository onto tape or another repository. With the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language of 'archive', it is the examiner's position that the first item in the repository will be the new class)(col 28, lines 41-62).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "creating a file ... custom data field" (ie., create a unique file comprising the item classification)(col 3, lines 10-20)(unique attributes for a specific class of entity)(col 1, lines 8-10).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "inserting the custom data field" (ie., classification tree nodes with new attributes for other business entities constructed)(col 4, lines 23-53).

Van Huben, in view of Maki does not expressly teach the amendments to the claims, but the Papiani article does suggest the amendments (ie., Papiani teaches a distributed scientific data archive using web, xml and SQL/MED for fast storage, searching and retrieval of large files using the web and object oriented technology such as Java Database Connectivity)(see Abstract, page 56; page 58, sec 2.1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben to include creating a unique file comprising unique attributes for a specific class of entity and to include classification tree nodes with the new attributes for other business entities newly constructed as taught by Maki, providing the benefit of a method of defining unique, user determined attributes in a data management system for file and database management for a design control system (Van Huben, col 5, lines 5-15; col 6, lines 55-60), further to include a distributed database system for archiving using object oriented technology as taught by Papiani, providing the benefit of fast storage (see Papiani, Abstract section).

Regarding claims 8 and 12, Van Huben teaches "model ... data field" (ie., snapshot of a library ... image of the library)(col 12, lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 11, Van Huben teaches a model of the custom data field (ie., provide a data management model structure as part of library ...)(col 7, lines 20-40; col 13, lines 59).

Van Huben teaches the currently amended claim limitation of archive field created by *packaging the file and the model into an archive file; an object-oriented class created by inserting the custom data field and adding the archive file; the archive file is compressed and wherein a directory structure of the archive file reflects a structure of an object-oriented class of the custom data field.* First, the Examiner reasonably interprets *compressed* to mean clustering or grouping of files since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'compressed'. The Examiner reasonably interprets '*object-oriented class*' to be equivalent to a collection of object instances of classes with attribute members that can be of the same class since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'object-oriented class'. The Examiner reasonably interprets the limitation of '*archive file*' as equivalent to a standard file which contains data or a collection of data since the Application's specification does not specifically define 'archive file'. The specification provides exemplary descriptions that are not limiting of scope.

Generally, Van Huben discloses a data management system having data management configurations (Title), that creates a model to hold the actual pieces of the design under control of the system without limit to the number of libraries, to allow for a hierarchical design and support for multiple users (Abstract section). Specifically, Van Huben discloses identifying all of the files used to create a model or grouping files together to facilitate transport through the medium (col 6, lines 30-35) coupled with the need to archive and back up data onto another repository (col 28, lines 41-45). The examiner interprets this disclosure as equivalent to the claimed packaging the file and model into an archive file and compressing it. Additionally, Van Huben discloses an object oriented database having a collection of object instances of classes where the attributes are the members of the object class (col 7, lines 1-5). The Examiner interprets Van Huben's attributes as equivalent to the claimed custom data fields. Van Huben discloses a control file database having a collection of files arranged along the records and a directory database having a collection of file directories which contain files with relationships as described by the directory structure with sub-directories and/or files (col 7, lines 5-11). The Examiner interprets this disclosure by Van Huben as equivalent to the amended claimed limitation of a directory structure of the archive file reflecting a structure. Examiner interprets Van Huben's collection of files as equivalent to an archive of files since collecting files is equivalent to packaging them.

Van Huben teaches "wherein the process management system executes on the computer system" (ie., running on a computer in a client/server environment)(col 11, lines 20-25).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "file ... properties" (ie., create a unique file comprising the item classification)(col 3, lines 10-20)(unique attributes for a specific class of entity)(col 1, lines 8-10).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "a new class created by inserting the custom data field" (ie., classification tree nodes with new attributes for other business entities constructed)(col 4, lines 23-53).

Van Huben, in view of Maki does not expressly teach the amendments to the claims, but the Papiani article does suggest the amendments (ie., Papiani teaches a distributed scientific data archive using web, xml and SQL/MED for fast storage, searching and retrieval of large files using the web and object oriented technology such as Java Database Connectivity)(see Abstract, page 56; page 58, sec 2.1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben to include creating a unique file comprising unique attributes for a specific class of entity and to include classification tree nodes with the new attributes for other business entities newly constructed as taught by Maki, providing the benefit of a method of defining unique, user determined attributes in a data management system for file and database management for a design control system (Van Huben, col 5, lines 5-15; col 6, lines 55-60), further to include a distributed database system for archiving using object oriented technology as taught by Papiani, providing the benefit of fast storage (see Papiani, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 15, Van Huben teaches "storage ... system" (ie., storage structure for data)(col 12, lines 1-5);

Van Huben teaches "a processor for creating and defining a custom data field within a process management system in the storage element (ie., running on a computer in a client/server environment)(col 11, lines 20-25);

Van Huben teaches "software instructions stored in the storage element for enabling the computer system under control of the processor (ie., the Design Control System can implement programs written in cross platform languages like Java and VRML ... interacting with objects)(col 11, lines 20-30).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "create a file ... custom data field" (ie., create a unique file comprising the item classification)(col 3, lines 10-20)(unique attributes for a specific class of entity)(col 1, lines 8-10).

Van Huben teaches "define a model ... field" (ie., provide a data management model structure as part of library ...)(col 7, lines 20-40; col 13, lines 59).

Van Huben teaches the currently amended claim limitation of *package the file and the model into an archive file, wherein the archive file is compressed and wherein a directory structure of the archive file reflects a structure of an object-oriented class of the custom data field.* First, the Examiner reasonably interprets *compressed* to mean clustering or grouping of files since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'compressed'. The Examiner reasonably interprets '*object-oriented class*' to be equivalent to a collection of object instances of classes with attribute members that can be of the same class since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'object-oriented class'. The Examiner reasonably interprets the limitation of '*archive file*' as equivalent to a standard file which contains data or a collection of data since the Application's specification does not specifically define 'archive file'. The specification provides exemplary descriptions that are not limiting of scope.

Generally, Van Huben discloses a data management system having data management configurations (Title), that creates a model to hold the actual pieces of the design under control of the system without limit to the number of libraries, to allow for a hierarchical design and support for multiple users (Abstract section). Specifically, Van

Huben discloses identifying all of the files used to create a model or grouping files together to facilitate transport through the medium (col 6, lines 30-35) coupled with the need to archive and back up data onto another repository (col 28, lines 41-45). The examiner interprets this disclosure as equivalent to the claimed packaging the file and model into an archive file and compressing it. Additionally, Van Huben discloses an object oriented database having a collection of object instances of classes where the attributes are the members of the object class (col 7, lines 1-5). The Examiner interprets Van Huben's attributes as equivalent to the claimed custom data fields. Van Huben discloses a control file database having a collection of files arranged along the records and a directory database having a collection of file directories which contain files with relationships as described by the directory structure with sub-directories and/or files (col 7, lines 5-11). The Examiner interprets this disclosure by Van Huben as equivalent to the amended claimed limitation of a directory structure of the archive file reflecting a structure. Examiner interprets Van Huben's collection of files as equivalent to an archive of files since collecting files is equivalent to packaging them.

Van Huben teaches "adding the archive file into the process management system as a new class" (ie., archiving and backing up is done with the Design Control Repository onto tape or another repository. With the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language of 'archive', it is the examiner's position that the first item in the repository will be the new class)(col 28, lines 41-62).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "insert the custom data field" (ie., classification tree nodes with new attributes for other business entities constructed)(col 4, lines 23-53).

Van Huben, in view of Maki does not expressly teach the amendments to the claims, but the Papiani article does suggest the amendments (ie., Papiani teaches a distributed scientific data archive using web, xml and SQL/MED for fast storage, searching and retrieval of large files using the web and object oriented technology such as Java Database Connectivity)(see Abstract, page 56; page 58, sec 2.1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben to include creating a unique file comprising unique attributes for a specific class of entity and to include classification tree nodes with the new attributes for other business entities newly constructed as taught by Maki, providing the benefit of a method of defining unique, user determined attributes in a data management system for file and database management for a design control system (Van Huben, col 5, lines 5-15; col 6, lines 55-60), further to include a distributed database system for archiving using object oriented technology as taught by Papiani, providing the benefit of fast storage (see Papiani, Abstract section).

Van Huben teaches "a processor ... element" (ie., unique user determined attributes for storing data)(col 5, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 16, Van Huben teaches "computer monitor ... system" (ie., individual computer 30 in Fig 1)(display screen for displaying images ... to user)(col 13, lines 15-30).

Regarding claim 17, Van Huben teaches "input device ... system" (ie., mouse interactions, fill-in fields must be keyed and/or mouse)(col 40, line 39).

4-2) Claims 4-7, 10, 13, 14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Huben et al (as cited above), in view of Maki et al (US 5201047, issued Apr 6, 1993), further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA"), further in view of Papiani (as cited above).

Regarding claim 4, Van Huben does teach the amended portions for object oriented class (ie., object oriented database)(see Abstract section).

Van Huben in view of Maki does not expressly teach, but AAPA teaches "deploying ... class" (ie., Deploy button)(fig 5, page 7, paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben in view of Maki to include deploying an application as taught by the AAPA, providing the benefit of implementing the attribute base classification (Maki, col 4, lines 54-57) in a data management system for file and database management for design control system (Van Huben, col 6, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 5, Van Huben does teach the amended portions for object oriented class (ie., object oriented database)(see Abstract section).

Van Huben in view of Maki does not expressly teach, but AAPA teaches "testing ... new class" (ie., Testing results displayed along with an action shows there is testing)(Fig 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben in view of Maki to include testing results of an application as taught by the AAPA, providing the benefit of implementing the attribute base classification (Maki, col 4, lines 54-57) in a data management system for file and database management for design control system (Van Huben, col 6, lines 55-60).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Van Huben in view of Maki does not expressly teach, but AAPA teaches "model ... interfaces" (ie., interfaces are "claim process" and "office setup"; the Process map shows the model)(Fig 5 and 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben in view of Maki to include testing results of an application as taught by the AAPA, providing the benefit of implementing the attribute base classification (Maki, col 4, lines 54-57) in a data management system for file and database management for design control system (Van Huben, col 6, lines 55-60).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, Van Huben teaches "class determines ... custom data field" (ie., data management of database with tables and attributes where attributes are unique and determined by the user)(col 6, lines 54-67; col 5, lines 5-15).

Regarding claims 10 and 18, Van Huben teaches "defining a model ... field" (ie., provide a data management model structure as part of library ...)(col 7, lines 20-40; col 13, lines 59).

Van Huben teaches the currently amended claim limitation of *packaging the file and the model into an archive file, wherein the archive file is compressed and wherein a directory structure of the archive file reflects a structure of an object-oriented class of the custom data field.* First, the Examiner reasonably interprets *compressed* to mean clustering or grouping of files since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'compressed'. The Examiner reasonably interprets '*object-oriented class*' to be equivalent to a collection of object instances of classes with attribute members that can be of the same class since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'object-oriented class'. The Examiner reasonably interprets the limitation of '*archive file*' as equivalent to a standard file which contains data or a collection of data since the Application's specification does not specifically define 'archive file'. The specification provides exemplary descriptions that are not limiting of scope.

Generally, Van Huben discloses a data management system having data management configurations (Title), that creates a model to hold the actual pieces of the design under control of the system without limit to the number of libraries, to allow for a hierarchical design and support for multiple users (Abstract section). Specifically, Van Huben discloses identifying all of the files used to create a model or grouping files together to facilitate transport through the medium (col 6, lines 30-35) coupled with the need to archive and back up data onto another repository (col 28, lines 41-45). The examiner interprets this disclosure as equivalent to the claimed packaging the file and model into an archive file and compressing it. Additionally, Van Huben discloses an object oriented database having a collection of object instances of classes where the attributes are the members of the object class (col 7, lines 1-5). The Examiner interprets Van Huben's attributes as equivalent to the claimed custom data fields. Van Huben discloses a control file database having a collection of files arranged along the records and a directory database having a collection of file directories which contain files with relationships as described by the directory structure with sub-directories and/or files (col 7, lines 5-11). The Examiner interprets this disclosure by Van Huben as equivalent to the amended claimed limitation of a directory structure of the archive file reflecting a structure. Examiner interprets Van Huben's collection of files as equivalent to an archive of files since collecting files is equivalent to packaging them.

Van Huben teaches *wherein the process management system executes on the computer system* (ie., running on a computer in a client/server environment)(col 11, lines 20-25).

Van Huben teaches "adding the archive file into the process management system as a new class (ie., archiving and backing up is done with the Design Control Repository onto tape or another repository. With the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language of 'archive', it is the examiner's position that the first item in the repository will be the new class)(col 28, lines 41-62).

Van Huben does teach the amended portions for object oriented class (ie., object oriented database)(see Abstract section).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches "creating a file ... custom data field" (ie., create a unique file comprising the item classification)(col 3, lines 10-20)(unique attributes for a specific class of entity)(col 1, lines 8-10).

Van Huben does not expressly teach, but Maki teaches inserting the custom data field (ie., classification tree nodes with new attributes for other business entities constructed)(col 4, lines 23-53).

Van Huben in view of Maki does not expressly teach, but AAPA teaches "deploying ... class" (ie., Deploy button)(fig 5, page 7, paragraph 20).

Van Huben in view of Maki does not expressly teach, but AAPA teaches "testing ... new class" (ie., Testing results displayed along with an action shows there is testing)(Fig 8).

Van Huben, in view of Maki and AAPA does not expressly teach the amendments to the claims, but the Papiani article does suggest the amendments (ie., Papiani teaches a distributed scientific data archive using web, xml and SQL/MED for fast storage, searching and retrieval of large files using the web and object oriented technology such as Java Database Connectivity)(see Abstract, page 56; page 58, sec 2.1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben to include creating a unique file comprising unique attributes for a specific class of entity, classification tree nodes with new attributes for other business entities newly constructed as taught by Maki, providing the benefit of a method of defining unique, user determined attributes in a data management system for file and database management for a design control system (Van Huben, col 5, lines 5-15; col 6, lines 55-60), further to include deploying and testing a data management system as taught by AAPA, providing the benefit of implementing the attribute base classification (Maki, col 4, lines 54-57) in a data management system for file and database management for design control system (Van Huben, col 6, lines 55-60), further to include a distributed database system for archiving using object oriented technology as taught by Papiani, providing the benefit of fast storage (see Papiani, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 19, Van Huben teaches "model ... data field" (ie., snapshot of a library ... image of the library)(col 12, lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 20, Van Huben in view of Maki does not expressly teach, but AAPA teaches "model ... interfaces" (ie., interfaces are "claim process" and "office setup"; the Process map shows the model)(Fig 5 and 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Huben in view of Maki to include testing results of an application as taught by the AAPA, providing the benefit of implementing the attribute base classification (Maki, col 4, lines 54-57) in a data management system for file and database management for design control system (Van Huben, col 6, lines 55-60).

Regarding claim 21, Van Huben teaches "class determines ... custom data field" (ie., data management of database with tables and attributes where attributes are unique and determined by the user)(col 6, lines 54-67; col 5, lines 5-15).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/8/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Amended claims 1, 10, 11, 15 and 18, **Applicant argues that the combination of references does not teach the amended limitations, *packaging a file and a model into an archive file, where the archive file is compressed and where a directory structure of the archive file reflects a structure of an object-***

oriented class of the custom data fields (see Remarks, pages 8-10; page 12, bottom).

The Examiner disagrees because Van Huben teaches the currently amended claim limitation. First, the Examiner reasonably interprets *compressed* to mean clustering or grouping of files since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'compressed'. The Examiner reasonably interprets '*object-oriented class*' to be equivalent to a collection of object instances of classes with attribute members that can be of the same class since the application's specification is silent about a definition or description of 'object-oriented class'. The Examiner reasonably interprets the limitation of '*archive file*' as equivalent to a standard file which contains data or a collection of data since the Application's specification does not specifically define 'archive file'. The specification provides exemplary descriptions that are not limiting of scope.

Generally, Van Huben discloses a data management system having data management configurations (Title), that creates a model to hold the actual pieces of the design under control of the system without limit to the number of libraries, to allow for a hierarchical design and support for multiple users (Abstract section). Specifically, Van Huben discloses identifying all of the files used to create a model or grouping files together to facilitate transport through the medium (col 6, lines 30-35) coupled with the need to archive and back up data onto another repository (col 28, lines 41-45). The examiner interprets this disclosure as equivalent to the claimed packaging the file and model into an archive file and compressing it. Additionally, Van Huben discloses an object oriented database having a collection of object instances of classes where the attributes are the members of the object class (col 7, lines 1-5). The Examiner interprets Van Huben's attributes as equivalent to the claimed custom data fields. Van Huben discloses a control file database having a collection of files arranged along the records and a directory database having a collection of file directories which contain files with relationships as described by the directory structure with sub-directories and/or files (col 7, lines 5-11). The Examiner interprets this disclosure by Van Huben as equivalent to the amended claimed limitation of a directory structure of the archive file reflecting a structure. Examiner interprets Van Huben's collection of files as equivalent to an archive of files since collecting files is equivalent to packaging them.

Applicant **argues the motivation to combine** the Papiani reference with Van Huben and Maki (Remarks, page 11, middle). The Examiner disagrees because Papiani discloses archiving using SQL for fast storage and retrieval of large data files (see Papiani Title and Abstract from 1999) and Van Huben discloses equivalent concepts. Specifically, Van Huben discloses identifying all the files used to crate a model and grouping together to facilitate transport of data through a medium (col 6, lines 30-35) coupled with the need to archive and back up data onto another repository (col 28, lines 41-45).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, **Applicant argues that the combination of references does not teach a model of a custom data field and a model comprising a written class and at least two implemented interfaces** (see Remarks, page 13, middle).

The Examiner disagrees. Van Huben discloses displaying a model for creation of the model, on one or more control screen sections which proves control information components as part of a control panel input screen allowing creation of a model by interactive user activity containing the data of screen sections, where the data fields comprise data entered in the form boxes (Van Huben, col 12, line 60 – col 13, line 20), providing a design control data management system capable of managing a coherent set of data objects in a computer environment (col 7, lines 57-60). This disclosure teaches the limitation of a custom data field by applying the broadest reasonable interpretation of the phrase 'custom data field', the Examiner interprets this phrase to mean any data field that is not automatically formatted, as consistent with the exemplary descriptions provided by Applicant in the specification. The Applicant does not provide a limiting definition of the phrase 'custom data field', and thus subject to broadest reasonable interpretation.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S 5/19/06

GS

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100